

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated November 9, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, and 16 are hereby amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 8 and 13-15 were previously canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-7, 9-12, and 16-20 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6, 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,586,586 to Stottmann (hereinafter “Stottmann”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,243,453 to Kawaguchi et al. (hereinafter “Kawaguchi”). *Office Action* at p. 2. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims and request reconsideration.

Independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a front display unit slidably coupled to at least one of the control panel and the front panel and including a display portion for displaying operational status of the dishwasher; and a sliding latch and a latch mounting slot for slidably coupling the front display unit, wherein the front display unit is disposed between the control panel and the front panel, and detachably coupled to at least one of the control panel and the front panel.” As admitted by the Office, *Stottmann* “does not teach the display portion is located on the display panel not the control panel.” *Office Action* at p. 3. Thus, *Stottmann* do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1.

Kawaguchi fails to cure the deficiencies of *Stottmann*. The Office asserts that *Kawaguchi* discloses “that the display panel (fig. 3, part 3) is between the control panel (fig. 6, part 6) and the front panel (fig. 3, part 7)” *Office Action* at p. 3. Thus, the Office construes *Kawaguchi*’s display section 3, control substrate 6 and substrate case 7 as the front display unit, control panel and front panel respectively, as recited in the claims. *Kawaguchi*, however, discloses that “[t]he control unit comprises a control substrate 6 and the display section 3” where “[t]he control substrate 6 and the display section 3 are incorporated together in a substrate case 7.” *Kawaguchi* at col. 3:32-35. Therefore, *Kawaguchi*’s reference 6 refers to a control substrate and not a control panel as asserted by the Office. Accordingly, *Kawaguchi* does not teach or suggest the display portion is located on the display panel not the control panel, as suggest by the Office.

Independent claim 1 also recites that “the front display unit is . . . detachably coupled to at least one of the control panel and the front panel.” In contrast, *Kawaguchi* discloses that “the control substrate 6 and display section 3 are incorporated together in the substrate case 7” and “the control substrate 6 is embedded in a synthetic resin layer 43.” *Kawaguchi* 3:34-35 and col. 8:47-48. Therefore, it is impossible that the display section 3 is detachably coupled to the control substrate 6 or the substrate case 7.

Independent claim 16 is allowable over the cited reference in that claim 16 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “preparing a control panel, a front panel, and a front display unit; forming a sliding latch and a latch mounting slot for sliding the front display unit; disposing the front display unit between the control panel and the front panel; and coupling the front display unit to at least one of the control panel and the front panel by sliding the sliding latch in the latch mounting receptacle, wherein the front display unit is detachably coupled to at least one of the control panel and the front panel.” For the same or similar reasons discussed above regarding claim 1, nothing in *Stottmann* or *Kawaguchi* teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Hence, Applicants respectfully assert that *Stottmann* and *Kawaguchi*, either singly or combined, do not teach or suggest at least the above feature of claim 16, and respectfully submit that independent claim 16 is patentable over *Stottmann* and *Kawaguchi*.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claims 1 and 16. Claim 2-4, 6 and 12 depend from independent claim 1. It stands to reason that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of those dependent claims should be withdrawn as well.

Claims 7-8 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Stottmann* in view of *Kawaguchi* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0201337 to *Weustefeld* (hereinafter “*Weustefeld*”). *Office Action* at p. 3. The rejection of claim 8 is moot as claim 8 has been previously canceled. Applicants traverse the rejection of the remaining claims and request reconsideration.

Weustefeld fails to cure the deficiencies of *Stottmann* and *Kawaguchi*. Indeed, the Office only relied upon *Weustefeld* purportedly disclosing “sliding latch . . . with a slot for that latch.” *Office Action* at p. 4. Because none of the cited references, either individually or in

combination, teaches or suggests each and every element of independent claims 1 and 16, they also fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 7, which depends from claim 1 and claims 17 and 18, which depend from claim 16. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 7, 17 and 18.

Claims 9-11 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Stottmann* and *Kawaguchi* 586 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,045,205 to Dingler (hereinafter ‘*Dingler*’). *Office Action* at p. 4. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims and request reconsideration.

Dingler fails to cure the deficiencies of *Stottmann* and *Kawaguchi*. Indeed, the Office only relied upon *Dingler* purportedly disclosing “a positioning tab and an aperture for the tab.” *Office Action* at p. 4. Because none of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every element of independent claims 1 and 16, they also fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 9-11, which depend from claim 1 and claims 19 and 20, which depend from claim 16. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 9-11 and 19-20.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, and/or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objection and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: January 8, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By /Michael I. Angert/

Michael I. Angert

Registration No.: 46,522

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorney for Applicant